



Meeting Summary

Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #1

July 1, 2010, 8:30 am – 12:30 pm

**Location: Sacramento National Wildlife Refuge Complex
752 County Road 99W
Willows, CA 95988**

WORK GROUP ATTENDANCE:

Name	Organization	Status
Bev Anderson	Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum	Member
Stuart Edell	Butte County Public Works	Member
Tom Ellis	Sacramento West Side Levee District, Land owners in the Colusa Basin, Member of the Board of Directors of Colusa County Farm Bureau.	Member
Pete Ghelfi	Sacramento Area Flood Control Association	Member
Les Heringer	Sacramento Valley Landowners Association	Member
Ashley Indrieri	Family Water Alliance	Member
Tom Karvonen	USACE	Member
Eric Larsen	UC Davis Department of Environmental Design	Member
John Linhart	Glenn County Planning & Public Works Agency	Member
Amy Lyons	California Department of Fish and Game	Member
Eugene Jr. Massa	Colusa Basin Drainage District	Member
Kelly Moroney	USFWS - Sacramento National Wildlife Refuge Complex	Member
Max Sakato	Reclamation District No. 1500 and CCVFCA	Member
Oscar Serrano	Colusa Indian Community Council	Member
James Strong	Farming, BSAGU	Member
Mark Tompkins	Newfields	Member
Gregg Werner	The Nature Conservancy	Member
Jeremy Arrich	CA Department of Water Resources	Chief, CVFPO*
Keith Swanson	CA Department of Water Resources	DWR Executive Sponsor
Michele Ng	CA Department of Water Resources	CVFPO Lead
Scott Rice	CA Department of Water Resources (consultant)	Regional Coordinator
Mary Randall	CA Department of Water Resources	Team
Natasha Nelson	CA Department of Water Resources	Team
Roger Putty	MWH Americas Inc.	Technical Support
Dorian Fougères	Center for Collaborative Policy	Facilitator
Ariel Ambruster	Center for Collaborative Policy	Facilitation Support /

Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #1

Name	Organization	Status
		Notetaker

*Central Valley Flood Planning Office

Absent:

Lewis Bair	RD 108, Sacramento River West Side Levee District, Knights Landing Ridge Drainage District	Member
John Carlon	River Partners, RHJV	Member
Jason Larrabee	Larrabee Farms, Glenn County	Member
Ernie Ohlin	Water Resources for Tehama County	Member

Observers:

Maddie Dunlap	Family Water Alliance
Steve Greco	UC Davis

ACTION ITEMS:

- Tom Ellis will help get CDFA representation (possibly Dave Pegos) in our work group
- DWR to add the management action information from slide #10 to the charter
- DWR to identify terminology used by Environmental Stewardship topic work group so that category now labeled "Ecosystem Restoration" reflects the work group's outcomes.
- On July 6, the management action and evaluation form information will be posted on the CVFMP website for your review. Please look at whether there are any categories missing. Is this list complete? Please submit your thoughts at the workshop or in writing, and remember that workshop comments are due within two days after each workshop.
- DWR to record the workshop webinars
- Work Group members to receive an e-mail next week to determine your availability for Meeting #2 in September.

To ask questions or comment about content, contact Roger Putty at roger.putty@mwhglobal.com. To provide comments or ask questions about logistical issues, contact Ariel Ambruster at aambrust@yahoo.com

MEETINGS SCHEDULE:

Meeting #2

Date: September
Place: TBD (Willows area)

Potential Meeting Locations:

- Mendocino National Forest Office, Willows
- Sacramento Refuge Offices, Willows area
- City or Glenn County Offices, Willows
- Colusa Industrial Park, Colusa
- City Offices, Colusa

Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #1

MEETING OVERVIEW:

MEETING OBJECTIVES:

The purpose for Meeting #1 was to initiate development of management actions for the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP).

1. Launch CVFPP Phase 2 and Affirm Regional Management Actions Work Group (RMAWG) Charter
2. Discuss the Relationship of Phase 2 to next Phases of the CVFPP
3. Receive Feedback on the Management Actions Categories and Evaluation Form
4. Organize for Phase 2 Workshops and future Phase 2 work

SUMMARY:

Welcome and Greetings

Meeting facilitator Dorian Fougères welcomed the meeting participants, led introductions and reviewed the day's agenda.

Review RMAWG Charter

Facilitator Dorian Fougères reviewed the draft RMAWG charter.

Q: What is the role of the FESSRO representative?

A: To focus on the conservation strategy, consider me to act as the DWR biologist for the group.

Comment: An issue is that agriculture is not in the charter. Agriculture has a huge stake in levee functions. I would recommend that the California Department of Food and Agriculture be involved. Dave Pegos was on the Agricultural Stewardship subcommittee.

Response: DWR has made a concerted effort to ensure there is agricultural representation on the regional committees. It's important that we try to make sure that the work group is composed of the who's who in this area. We would appreciate it if you can help us bring those additional people here.

Comment: Put definition of management actions (slide #10) in the charter.

Opening Remarks

Executive Sponsor Keith Swanson, with the aid of PowerPoint slides, discussed the vision moving forward to the 2012 CVFPP and subsequent plans, and how these will be complemented by the State Plan of Flood Control descriptive document, which describes the current system, and the Flood Control System Status Report, which discusses how the system is working. For sustainability, it will be important to integrate the needs of water supply, public safety and the environment. DWR is conducting scoping now on a programmatic EIR and will keep the work group members updated.

CVFPO Chief Jeremy Arrich said he hopes work group members will conduct a thorough review of the Flood Control System Status Report when it is released in September. DWR wants to make sure it contains the best and most up-to-date information.

CVFPO Lead Michele Ng gave a recap of Phase 1. DWR has received work group member comments on the Regional Conditions Report, and appreciates them. A primary outcome of Phase 1 was the development of CVFPP goals: a primary goal of improving flood risk management, and secondary goals of improving operation and maintenance; promoting ecosystem functions: improving institutional support; and promoting multi-benefit projects.

Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #1

Overview of Management Actions Development Process, Organization, and Documentation

Roger Putty of MWH, Technical Support, gave a PowerPoint presentation which provided an overview of management actions and the Phase 2 process. An initial set of management actions was developed from reference documents and input from work group members in Phase 1. Meeting #1 will be followed by two rounds of workshops before Meeting #2, which are intended to dig deeper into the management actions and identify gaps. Round 1 will be the week of July 19, and Round 2 the week of August 23. The workshops will be held in Sacramento, with a webinar option so interested individuals can participate remotely. The Round 1 workshops will include review and development of management actions for each category. The Round 2 workshops will look at different community perspectives related to the application of certain management actions and their integration with environmental, water supply, and other potential benefits. Topic Work Groups will begin meeting soon and will focus on technical aspects, such as data, tools and evaluation methods. Upper Sacramento RMAWG Meeting #2 will be held in September, and a poll will be coming out soon to determine work group member availability.

Comment: For workshops, consider a bigger meeting space. There may be greater interest than you realize.

Comment: I'm concerned that they are in Sacramento, far from some parts of the regions.

Q: Is the ag stewardship work group going to continue?

A: There is still a role for subcommittees in this part of the process.

Management Action Summary Table

Roger Putty asked work group members to review the organization and categorization of the summary table and consider how the categories are organized, whether the list is clear or not, and if there are gaps.

Comment: I would prefer the management actions on the X axis, and an ability for the table to track complementary/conflicting goals. That way, complementary items can move forward.

Response: It's important to clarify that there may be different answers or approaches to this list for each region. During Phase 3, the focus will be on considering management actions and solution sets at each regional level.

Comment: Capture legal issues separately from policy and regulations, or place legal issues under policy & regulations. An example of a legal issue would be "Resolve channel maintenance responsibility."

Comment: Add legal as a column.

Q: How do categories relate to each other? Is there any pattern?

A: The categories were not developed with any interrelations in mind.

Ways to organize/associate categories:

- Disaster Preparedness & Flood Warning with Floodplain Management
- Flood Fighting, Emergency Response & Flood Recovery with Floodplain Management, with Operations & Maintenance

Comment: Schedule related workshops on the same day.

Comment: Change "Ecosystem Restoration" to "Ecosystem Conservation."

Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #1

Comment: A name like "Ecosystem Functions" or "Ecosystem Processes" might better reflect the overall intent of the group of monitoring actions.

Comment: We should use the terminology that the Environmental Stewardship Topic Work Group recommended. Check to see what the outcomes were from that group.

Comment: Change "Flood Protection System Modification," which is very general, to "Flood Conveyance Facilities."

Q: How will the term "storage" be viewed by the public? Will the public understand that it's beyond dams?

Comment: Perhaps there could be definitions of categories to clarify the meaning.

Comment: The public may think it means dams.

Comment: Qualify the category by renaming it "Additional Floodplain & Reservoir Storage."

Comment: The term "transitory storage" should be added to the glossary.

Response: Next Tuesday, when information is put on the website, each management action will have its own definition. Many of the terms will be defined in this way.

Comment: IPS1 uses flood terms such as flood management, flood risk and flood damage loosely. These terms should be defined more clearly when they are used, and definitions should be used consistently.

Comment: Define "spillway surcharge."

Comment: Is there a way to address IRWMP and its context to flood planning – a way to emphasize that in the categories? Perhaps it could be addressed as a check-off column.

Response: Perhaps it could be included in a column on relations to other programs.

Draft Management Action Evaluation Form

Roger Putty gave an overview of design of the draft form. He said it is not a screening tool, but an informational tool, a way to consistently address each management action. Is there anything missing from the form design?

Comment: Flag legal issues on forms.

Comment: You said that these forms are intended to be informational, but the item "Recommendations (Retain/Not Retained/Requires Further Evaluation)" is an evaluation.

Response: That's a good point. This was an internal DWR screen used to determine if the proposed management action was redundant, or perhaps was a principle rather than a management action. No management action is being considered for removal at this time. Work groups will address whether the management actions should be retained in Phases 3 and 4.

Comment: We aren't seeing what was not retained.

Comment: I find this part of the form helpful -- it helps me understand DWR's approach, in order to prepare for the workshop.

Comment: Under Environmental Considerations, add a question: Can it be quantitatively evaluated?

Comment: Include a section on complementary/conflicting management actions to show the relationship among management actions, if any.

Comment: Reference related studies for each management action.

Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #1

Response: The form has a place for references.

Comment: The reference might go in the management action report.

Looking Forward to Creating Solution Sets

Roger Putty, with the aid of PowerPoint slides, discussed the process that will occur later during Phase 2 to develop regional and systemwide solution sets.

Jeremy Arrich noted that the five bullets on the PowerPoint slide are not a solution set. An example of one theme could be to only fix State Plan of Flood Control facilities, but put no resources into O&M or the ecosystem. Another theme might be a full multi-benefit approach, with resources focused towards O&M, institutional support, and levels of the five different bullets. A solution set is similar to an alternative, but at the end, DWR will not pick a preferred alternative. We want to identify common elements of all the solution sets, so we can implement those and then further refine actions and approaches.

Q: Can each region pick a different theme?

A: Yes – The region will help us understand the trade-offs of different options.

Q: Management actions are already underway. Why evaluate them? What happens if we determine that the action is not appropriate?

A: That's a good point. There hasn't been a plan before, so it's important to evaluate them and ensure everything is consistent with the vision of the state, and that it is all part of a package. It's important to have an analysis and evaluation to help communicate with the public and the Legislature what our best vision is. In regards to dealing with existing facilities and parallel plans that diverge from the CVFPP, we will need to be pragmatic in the analysis and incorporate them, while working to understand and convey the larger context and benefits of our work.

Comment: It is confusing how the five points on the PowerPoint relate to the five goals of the plan. They are similar, but not exact.

Response: That's true – they support the goals. There will need to be consistent language of these are meant to mirror the goals - the language is close but not identical.

Comment: We need to understand the terms. It is not clear.

Response: It's really the management actions that will go into the solution sets.

Comment: Perhaps it would be better to call "solution set" an "alternative." Each alternative has a solution set of management actions.

Response: The difference from CEQA is we won't pick one preferred alternative. There would still be ongoing study and an iterative process.

Q: Is this a way to organize a group of management actions for analysis?

Comment: It would be helpful to provide an example of a solution set to show how management actions could be combined.

Comment: It would be helpful if you could specify 4-5 possible solution sets.

Response: Our choices are to stay with the existing system, which requires a lot of O&M. If we choose to maintain that, there would be limited ecosystem restoration, high O&M costs to deal with erosion and seepage and low initial costs. A second approach would be a system redesign approach, an Everglades type of level. There would be huge initial costs, huge land-use decisions, a higher environmental restoration potential and lower O&M costs. When this is implemented on the ground, one would look at the regional and system perspectives. Decisions in one region would affect other regions.

Response: A caveat is that the plan might be fairly general. We might say, in this region, you'll have 4 miles of setback levees and floodplain management, and it will cost a certain amount of money. We might

Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #1

not tell you where to put the levees or what actions to do. If we were that general, not site-specific, would that work for you? We don't know how specific we will get.

Comment: Perhaps environmental restoration could be a solution set.

Q: What level of consensus does this group need to have at the end of the day? What level of support from this group are you looking for?

A: We are looking for broad support for something to move forward.

Comment: We will drive DWR to specifics, in order that we can identify how it will affect us. One thing that would help would be to identify: What is our base condition?

Response: We will have that in September when the Flood Control System Status Report is released.

Comment: As a group, we will only be able to agree on maybe one solution set, given our different interests.

Response: We think we can get solution sets that work for everybody in multiple ways. If we protect species, we can't make O&M or farming more difficult. Those management actions that meet multiple goals and interests we will focus on to implement in the short term. The solution set is just a way to structure the conversation.

Comment: I would recommend no themes. They are very similar to goals.

Comment: Each subregion within the region will have unique priorities (Butte Basin, for example).

Comment: It would be helpful for the plan team to come up with some straw solution sets for us to consider.

Preparing for Management Action Workshops

Jeremy Arrich asked that those who want to participate in the workshops come prepared to comment, as they will be very fast-paced.

Facilitator Dorian Fougères reviewed the structure of the workshops and encouraged work group members to participate.

Q: How will the workshops be advertised?

A: Advertising will be similar to what was done for the Valleywide Forum, through the website and e-mail blasts.

Action item for workgroup members: Please look at whether there are any categories missing. Is this list complete? Submit your thoughts at the workshop or in writing within two days after the workshop.

Comment: It would be helpful if you could identify which region the comments are coming from, as comments might apply differently in different regions.

Next Meetings, Action Item Review, Meeting Recap

DWR Lead Michele Ng and Ariel Ambruster, Facilitation Support, discussed how work group members can submit comments and questions, and how these are responded to.

To ask questions or comment about content, contact Roger Putty at roger.putty@mwhglobal.com. To provide comments or ask questions about logistical issues, contact Ariel Ambruster at aambrust@yahoo.com

Correction to the contact list telephone number for Michele Ng, our DWR CVFPO lead: 916-716-1913.

Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #1

Follow-up for absentee members:

- Max Sakato will contact Lewis Bair with a binder
- Gregg Werner will contact John Carlon with a binder
- Ashley Indrieri will telephone Jason Larrabee, and the plan team will send him a binder
- Bev Anderson will telephone Ernie Ohlin